Gc
974.4
An2l
1771833

M. L.

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01092 5920

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/lettertosfwetmor00andr_0

LETTER

TO

S. F. Wetmore

By

John Albion Andrew

Boston
1863

1771833

1.

F
844
.033

Andrew, John A Ibion, 1818–1867.

Letter to S. F. Wetmore, Indianapolis, Feb. 3, 1863. Boston, 1863.

8 p. 22cm.

No t.-p.
Signed: John A. Andrew.
Concerning the relative number of troops furnished by Massachusetts and Indiana, in 1861 and 1862. Also, comparing the military service of Massachusetts and other New England states, with that of the southern states during the revolution.

SELF CARD

Subject entries: Massachusetts—Hist.—Civil war.

2-14472

06102

Library of Congress, no. F 8349 E513.A56.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, BOSTON, Feb. 3, 1863.

S. F. WETMORE, Esq., *Indianapolis, Indiana:* —

My Dear Sir, — Your letter of the 22d January would have received that prompt attention which the subject itself demands, and which is surely due to the interest you have manifested, on more than one occasion, in the establishment of the truth touching the conduct of New England, and particularly of Massachusetts, when arraigned by persons of other sections of the country, had my engagements permitted an earlier reply.

You inform me, in the first place, that a committee has been raised by the popular branch of the legislature of Indiana, to inquire and report, *Why Massachusetts has not sent to the field during the present war as many men as have been sent by Indiana.*

I do not know how many men have been furnished to the Union army hitherto by the State of Indiana. I am unable, therefore, to present you the facts sought for in the form of a comparative statement. And I am not sorry, for the purposes of the present moment, that I am thus ignorant, since the testimony I shall give you will be relieved of the moral disadvantages which would attend the effort of reciting facts and presenting an argumentative comparison at the same time. I may be allowed to remark, however, that while we in Massachusetts have devoted ourselves to the business of the national defence with an earnestness, zeal, and success which have aroused the hatred of every enemy of the Union, scarcely less apparent on the lips of Northern sympathizers with treason than of Southern traitors and rebels themselves, I have always believed that the government and people of Indiana have been alike distinguished, from the beginning of the struggle, by the fidelity of their exertions and the valor of their troops.

The contribution of Massachusetts to the Union army, in the year 1861, was twenty-two regiments and eight companies of infantry, two companies of sharpshooters, five batteries of light artillery, and one regiment of cavalry, all enlisted for three years, besides five regiments of infantry, one battalion of rifles, and one company of artillery, who served for three months.

The contribution of 1862, made by Massachusetts to the Union army, was thirty regiments and four companies of infantry, of which thirteen regiments and three companies were enlisted for three years, seventeen regiments for nine months, and one company for six months; five batteries of light artillery, of which three were enlisted for three years, one for nine months, and one for six months; five companies of heavy artillery enlisted for three years; three companies of cavalry enlisted for three years; two companies of militia, one of which served for two months, and the other for five months.

30610

Since the beginning of 1863 two more batteries of light artillery have marched from the State, leaving still two others now in process of recruitment, and a second regiment of cavalry, of which one battalion is now ready to march. A third company of sharpshooters and a sixth company of heavy artillery are also in process of recruitment. It should be added that one of the regiments originally raised in 1861, composed of ten companies of infantry, was subsequently enlarged to a regiment of heavy artillery. Having thus given you, as nearly as may be, the military *organizations* sent by Massachusetts to the field during the war, allow me to present a statement prepared by the Adjutant General of the Commonwealth, at my request, exhibiting the whole number of men enlisted therein, both originally and for their subsequent recruitment, up to January 1st, 1863: —

Whole number of three months men,			3,736
Whole number of three years men reported up to Nov. 15th, 1862,		56,214	
Whole number of three years men reported as mustered in since Nov. 15th, (perhaps 100 short,)	2,184		
Whole number of nine months men,	16,896		
		19,080	
Total three years and nine months men,			75,294
Total also including the three months men,			79,030

Permit me to add, though I am answering now only for my own Commonwealth, that I do not pretend for a moment that our sister States of New England would at all suffer by any comparison with Massachusetts. They would not.

The extended sea-coast line of Massachusetts has naturally engaged a large number of her able-bodied men in the business of navigation, whaling, and the fisheries. These men, from their training, have been attracted in large numbers to the naval service, in preference to that of any military arm upon the land. The numbers thus drawn into the navy I am unable to declare with exact precision. From the best sources of information, sought for among gentlemen connected with commerce and navigation, I am brought to the opinion that about 12,000 men are or have been engaged in the naval service on the ocean, or in gunboat service on the rivers, whose homes are in Massachusetts. Besides this number, about 3,000 more are believed to be occupied as seamen, engineers, or otherwise, in the transport service on the sea.

For the purpose of enabling our friends at the West to decide for themselves whether (considered, either positively or by comparison with other States) this Commonwealth has omitted her proper contribution to the human forces of the war, I beg you to remember that our population by the census of 1860 was a total of 1,231,066, including both sexes, aliens and persons of all races and complexions, and that the white males of Massachusetts of all ages were 592,231. The population of the State of Indiana, by the same census, presented a like total of 1,350,428, of which number the white males of all ages were 693,348. Thus the population of Indiana exceeded that of Massachusetts by 119,362, and the number of male inhabitants of Indiana exceeded the males of Massachusetts by the number of 101,117. This statement illustrates not only the absolute excess of population in Indiana over that of Massachusetts, but also the relative excess of males in Indiana over the males of Massachusetts as compared with the aggregate population of the two States respectively.

The number of male inhabitants of Massachusetts is 85 41-100 per cent. of the male inhabitants of Indiana, and, at first blush, it would seem that the military contribution of men by the two States should be in that proportion.

This, however, is not necessarily true, allowing relative equality to be the rule of duty. Because the proportion of men fitted to bear arms in the State of Massachusetts may not be in the same ratio to the whole number of her male inhabitants, which the number of the same class of male inhabitants of Indiana bears to the aggregate number of her male population. For example, in two such States the relative proportions of their men capable of bearing arms will necessarily be affected by all those circumstances which tend to create differences in the character of the populations of old communities, and those more recently settled. In an old community the number of aged men and women must be found proportionately larger, because such persons are not usually migratory, while young and active men and women form the larger share of immigrants to new States.

Of this fact one readily perceives a striking illustration in the large number of the officers whose places of birth as well as names are known to us found serving in the regiments or credited to the account of our younger sister States, who, born in the older Commonwealths of New England and emigrating to the West, have identified their personal fortunes with the rising glories of those attractive and flourishing portions of our national heritage.

I have not seen stated the number of the enrolled Militia of Indiana, as it appears by the last enrolment. The number of the enrolled Militia of Massachusetts returned by the Assessors of each city and town the last autumn was 176,364, including of course her citizens both at home and already in the *field*. From this number, however, is to be deducted those physically disabled from military service and liable to rejection therefor, or otherwise exempted by law. This reduced the whole number of the enrolled Militia of Massachusetts, belonging to the class of non-exempts, to 140,796.

The whole amount of military expenditure on account of the United States for the past year is $199,982.67, and the total amount expended and charged to the General Government since the commencement of the war is $3,450,110.52. This includes the purchase of arms, horses, wagons, equipments, subsistence, and other supplies required in the raising, outfit and movement of troops, and it does *not* include any sums paid in the nature of bounties nor of aid to the families of volunteers.

Thus much for our record. Whether we have done well or done ill I may not attempt to decide. But I pray those who would criticise any shortcoming of Massachusetts, in camp or on the field, by land or sea, in arts or arms, in any of the works or the dangers of patriotic duty, to declare affirmatively, and by methods the most positive and responsible, wherein she has failed or fallen short. And if the accusation shall come from men who have striven hitherto and are striving *now* to crush the rebellion, and to conquer the power against which our brethren have drawn the sword and opposed their lives, I am sure that Massachusetts will cheerfully accept the instruction, and will supply the omitted duty.

You have done me the honor, also, to inquire, *What was done by the men of Massachusetts for the military service of the United States during the war of the Revolution?* An answer was furnished to the question by the Department of War in 1790, on the call of Fisher Ames. General Knox was, at that time, the Secretary of War. It is contained in a statement copied from the first volume of the American Archives. It exhibits not only the contribution of troops made by Massachusetts to the war of the Revolution, but also the contribution made by each of the original thirteen States.

Statement of the number of Troops and Militia furnished by the several States, for the support of the Revolutionary War, from 1775 *to* 1783, *inclusive.*

STATES.	Number of Continental Troops.	No. of Militia.	Total number of Militia & Continental Troops.	Conjectural estimate of Militia.
Northern.				
New Hampshire,	12,496	2,093	14,598	7,300
Massachusetts,	67,937	15,155	83,092	9,500
Rhode Island,	5,908	4,284	10,192	1,500
Connecticut,	32,039	7,792	39,831	3,000
New York,	17,781	3,312	21,093	8,750
Pennsylvania,	25,608	7,357	32,965	2,000
New Jersey,	10,727	6,055	16,782	2,500
Totals,	172,496	46,048	218,553	30,950
Southern.				
Delaware,	2,387	376	2,263	1,000
Maryland,	13,912	5,464	19,376	4,000
Virginia,	26,672	4,163	30,835	21,880
North Carolina,	7,263	2,716	9,969	12,000
South Carolina,	5,508	–	5,508	28.000
Georgia,	2,679	–	2,679	9,930
Totals,	58,421	12,719	71,130	76,810

The following Table exhibits a comparative view of the populations of the New England States and of the Southern States, severally and respectively, according to the census of 1790; attended by an exhibit of the authenticated troops furnished by each of those States and both sections:—

New England States.	Population in 1790.	No. of Continental Troops and Militia furnished to War of Revolution.	Southern States.	Population in 1790.	No. of Continental Troops and Militia furnished to War of Revolution.
Massachusetts,	475,257	83,092	Delaware,	59,096	2,763
Connecticut,	238,141	39,831	Maryland,	319,728	19,376
New Hampshire,	141,899	14,598	Virginia,	748,308	30,835
Rhode Island,	69,110	10,192	North Carolina,	393,751	9,969
			South Carolina,	249,073	5,508
Totals,	924,407	147,713	Georgia,	82,548	2,679
			Totals,	1,852,504	71,130

Thus it will be seen that Massachusetts alone, with only about one-fourth the population of the South, furnished 11,962 more authenticated troops than they all; and that the four New England States of the old thirteen, with a trifle less than one-half of the population of the six States of the South, contributed, of continental and authenticated militia troops, a little more than twice as many as the contribution of the South to the national cause of independence. In actual numbers, the New England contingent, furnished by a population of 924,407, was 147,713 soldiers, against the southern contingent

of 71,130 soldiers, furnished by a population of 1,852,504. Thus, New England gave of her sons in the proportion of more than four to one, compared with the authenticated southern roll of revolutionary troops.

Your letter suggests, also, these significant and important questions: "*What interest Massachusetts has taken in the North-West, in the way of favoring its settlement? How much money she has expended in roads, canals, and railways? What she may have done to induce education, religion, and morality, among our people?*"

The field of inquiry on which you have opened is nearly without limit. Nor do any means of reply, with statistical precision, exist anywhere. But I am making an effort to accumulate, through a variety of sources, an array of facts, which, with some pains, I am well aware may be combined and arranged so as to disclose the amplest proofs of the cordial good will and interest constantly felt and manifested from the beginning, not less in the moral welfare than in the material growth and the industrial development of the West by the people of New England. The results of these investigations will form the substance of another communication.

Meanwhile, will you allow me to allude to the characteristic policy in national affairs, by which the statesmen of the East have distinguished their influence in the national legislation bearing on the interest of the Western States? I do so, not only for the purpose of illustrating what we regard as our prescriptive career of friendship, but because it enables me to introduce evidence drawn from public history, and the opinions of eminent men, expressed in better words than mine. To this end I have extracted the following paragraph from the speech of Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, in the Senate of the United States, in January, 1852, in support of a bill granting the right of way and certain public lands in Iowa to aid the construction of certain roads in that State. Mr. Sumner said:—

"In sustaining this bill, I but followed the example of the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts on kindred measures, from their earliest introduction down to the present time. The first instance was in 1823, on the grant of the State of Ohio of land one hundred and twenty-five feet wide, with one mile on each side, for the construction of a road from the lower rapids of the Miami River to the western boundary of the Connecticut Reserve. On the final passage of this grant in the House, the Massachusetts delegation voted as follows: Yeas.—Samuel C. Allen, Henry W. Dwight, Timothy Fuller, Jeremiah Nelson, John Reed, Jonathan Russell. Nay.—Benjamin Gorham. In the Senate, the bill passed without a division. In 1828, a still greater unanimity occurred, on the passage of the bill to aid the State of Ohio in extending the Miami Canal from Dayton to Lake Erie; and this bill is the first instance of the grant of alternate sections, as in that now before the Senate.

"On this the Massachusetts delegation in the House voted as follows: Yeas.—Isaac C. Bates, Benjamin W. Crowninshield, John Davis, Edward Everett, John Locke, John Reed, Joseph Richardson, John Varnum. Nays.—None. In the Senate, Messrs. Silsbee and Webster both voted in the affirmative. I pass over the intermediate grants, which, I am told, have been sustained by the Massachusetts delegations with substantial unanimity.

"The extensive grants at the last session of Congress to Illinois, Mississippi, and Alabama, in aid of a railroad from Chicago to Mobile, were sustained by all the Massachusetts votes in the House except one. Still further, in sustaining the present bill on grounds of justice to the land States, I but followed the recorded instructions of the Legislature of Massachusetts, addressed to its Senators and Representatives here on a former occasion.

"The subject was presented, in a special message, to the Legislature in 1841, by the distinguished Governor at the time, who strongly urged 'a liberal policy toward the actual settler, and *toward the new States*, for this is justly due to both.' And he added: 'Such States are entitled to a more liberal share of

the proceeds of the public lands than the old States, as we owe to their enterprise much of the value this property has acquired. *It seems to me, therefore, that justice toward the States in which these lands lie demands a liberal and generous policy toward them.*' In accordance with this recommendation, it was resolved by the Legislature, 'That, in the disposition of the public lands, *this Commonwealth approves of making liberal provisions in favor of the new States;* and that she ever has been and still is ready to co-operate with other portions of the Union, in securing to those States such provisions.' Thus, a generous policy toward the land States, with liberal provisions in their favor, was considered by Massachusetts the part of justice."

What could be more triumphant in the confidence of its tone, the emphasis of its contradiction, than the defiant denial with which Mr. Webster, on the same floor, met the attack of Mr. Calhoun, whose political disciples, in whatever section of the Union, have not failed to imitate the traits of his mischievous career.

In his remarkable speech on "Foot's Resolution," Mr. Webster exclaimed:

"I deny that the East has, at any time, shown an illiberal policy towards the West. I pronounce the whole accusation to be without the least foundation in any facts, existing either now or at any previous time.

"I deny it in the general, and I deny each and all its particulars. I deny the sum total, and I deny the detail. I deny that the East has ever manifested hostility to the West, and I deny that she has adopted any policy that would naturally have led her in such a course."

And, further on in the same speech, Mr. Webster declares, "I maintain that, from the day of the cession of the territories by the States to Congress, no portion of the country has acted either with more liberality or more intelligence, on the subject of the public lands in the new States, than New England."

And, again, supporting the declaration, he says:—

"At the foundation of the Constitution of those new North Western States lies the celebrated Ordinance of 1787. We are accustomed, Sir, to praise the lawgivers of antiquity; we help to perpetuate the fame of Solon and Lycurgus; but I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the Ordinance of 1787. That instrument was drawn by Nathan Dane, then and now a citizen of Massachusetts.

* * * * * * *

"It was sustained, indeed by the votes of the South, but it must have failed without the cordial support of the New England States. If New England has been governed by the narrow and selfish views now ascribed to her, this very measure was, of all others, the best calculated to thwart her purposes. It was of all things, the very means of rendering certain a vast immigration from her own population to the West. She looked to that consequence only to disregard it."

And yet again:—

"I assert, boldly, that in all measures conducive to the welfare of the West, since my acquaintance here, no part of the country has manifested a more liberal policy. I beg to say, sir, that I do not state this with a view of claiming for her any special regard on that account. Not at all. She does not place her support of measures on the ground of favor conferred. Far otherwise. What she has done has been consonant to her view of the general good, and therefore she has done it. She has sought to make no gain of it; on the contrary, individuals may have felt, undoubtedly, some natural regret at finding the relative importance of their own States diminished by the growth of the West. But New England has regarded that as the natural course of things, and has never complained of it.

"Let me see any one measure favorable to the West which has been opposed by New England, since the government bestowed its attention on these Western improvements. Select what you will,—if it be a measure of

acknowledged utility, — I answer for it, it will be found that not only were New England votes cast for it, but that *New England votes carried it.* Will you take the Cumberland Road? — who has made that? Will you take the Portland Canal? — whose support carried that bill? Sir, at what period beyond the Greek Kalends, could these measures, or measures like these, have been accomplished, had they depended on the votes of Southern gentlemen.

"Why, sir, we know that we must have waited till the constitutional notions of those gentlemen had undergone an entire change. Generally speaking, they have done nothing, and can do nothing. All that has been effected has been done by the votes of reproached New England. I undertake to say, sir, that if you look to the votes on any one of these measures, and strike out from the list of ayes the names of New England members, it will be found that, in every case, the South would then have voted down the West, and the measure would have failed. I do not believe any one instance can be found where this is not strictly true. I do not believe that one dollar has been expended for these purposes beyond the mountains, which could have been obtained without cordial coöperation and support from New England.

"Sir, I put the question to the West itself. Let gentlemen who have sat here ten years come forth and declare by what aids, and by whose votes, they have succeeded in measures deemed of essential importance to their part of the country. To all men of sense and candor, in or out of Congress, who have any knowledge upon the subject, New England may appeal for refutation of the reproach it is now attempted to cast upon her in this respect.

"I take the liberty to repeat that I make no claim on behalf of New England, or on account of that which I have now stated. She does not profess to have acted out of favor, for it would not become her so to have acted. She asks for no special thanks; but, in the consciousness of having done her duty in these things uprightly and honestly, and with a fair and liberal spirit, be assured she will repel, whenever she thinks the occasion calls for it, an unjust and groundless imputation of partiality and selfishness."

And now, I pray you, in contrast with the language of Webster, to read that of McDuffee, in 1825, replying to Mr. Webster, then a member of the House of Representatives. Fail not to contrast the sentiments of Massachusetts with the sentiments of South Carolina. Remember that the doctrines of Mr. Webster, in 1825, were those of Mr. Sumner in 1852, and are held not less firmly now by the men of New England, marching shoulder to shoulder with the men of the West* in upholding the only national government the West has ever known in all her history, and the protection of which has conducted her on to greatness, that government whose cradle New England rocked in the hours of its infancy, and for whose life New England will, if need be, maintain the struggle until time shall be no more.

1771833

But, listen, I pray you, to McDuffee: —

"The gentleman from Massachusetts has urged, as one leading reason why the government should make roads to the West, that these roads have a tendency to settle the public lands, that they increase the inducements to settlement, and that this is a national object. Sir, I differ entirely from his views on the subject. I think that the public lands are settling quite fast enough, that our people need no stimulus to urge them thither, but want rather a check, at least on that artificial tendency to Western settlement which we have created by our own laws.

"The gentleman says that the great object of government with regard to these lands is, not to make them a source of revenue, but to get them settled. What would have been thought of this argument in the old thirteen States?

* It should not be overlooked that Massachusetts regiments, and many others from New England, are now under Major-General Banks, of Massachusetts, co-operating at New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Port Hudson, in opening the River Mississippi.

It amounts to this, that those States are to offer a bonus of their own impoverishment, to create a vortex to swallow up our floating population. Look, sir, at the present aspect of the Southern States. In no part of Europe will you see the same indications of decay. Deserted villages, houses falling to ruin, impoverished lands thrown out of cultivation. Sir, I believe that if the public lands had never been sold, the aggregate amount of the national wealth would have been greater at this moment. Our population, if concentrated in the old States, and not ground down by tariffs, would have been more prosperous and wealthy. But every inducement has been held out to them to settle in the West, until our population has become sparse, and then the effects of this sparseness are now to be counteracted by another artificial system.

"Sir, I say, if there is any object worthy the attention of this Government, it is a plan which shall limit the sale of the public lands. If those lands were sold according to their real value, be it so. But while the Government continues as it does, to give them away, they will draw the population of the older States, and still further increase the effect which is already distressingly felt, and which must go to diminish the value of all those States possess. And this, sir, is held out to us as a motive for granting the present appropriation. I would not, indeed, prevent the formation of roads on these considerations, but certainly would not encourage it."

We of Massachusetts are as little in sympathy with the McDuffee of 1825, and the Calhoun of 1829, as with the "institution" around which crystalized the politics of South Carolina, of which Secessionism is the product, and which is the boasted "corner-stone" of the "Confederacy" of Traitors. Does the Northwest demand a highway for the procession of her teeming granaries to the sea, which will surpass the "Father of Waters" in its value to the commerce of the world and to the farmers of the agricultural States? She will look, even now, to the members from New England to support her ship canal uniting the Mississippi with Lake Michigan, and to secure its passage. I trust she will not be mistaken.

The doctrines of Mr. Webster, thirty years ago, are not less true or acceptable to Massachusetts to-day. And I pray you to remember that whenever New England has been accused of singularity, the charge has never rested for its facts on the narrowness, but only on the comprehensive breadth of her principles and her methods. We do not believe that the road to prosperity and honor lies over the misfortune of other States or other men. We hold that in the moral welfare, the material wealth, the industrial development and intellectual power of all states and people shall we share ourselves; striving to be unlike the spider, who sucks poison from the sweetest flower, but like the bee, which draws nurture even from the humblest.

While I put forward no claim to intrinsic or original superiority in the New England character, I do assert the facts of her history and her traditional policy. These are due to her institutions of education, and to the little democracies of her towns. Through the power of these institutions, ideas and intelligence are enabled to control her conduct in public affairs. While, in the South, a single class interest, crushing out the life of democracy, which is found in the intellectual culture of the people, dominates all others, and subordinates the many to the despotism of the few.

Hence, my dear sir, this war of rebellion. And in the issues of this war are involved the triumph or defeat of all which has made the West and the East, alike, prosperous, happy, and free.

With the heartiest good will,

I am yours, faithfully and respectfully,

JOHN A. ANDREW.

F844.033

6029 1